

GATEWAY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
November 16, 2021

Public Comments Received Prior To Rescheduled October
25th Board Meeting

*The public was encouraged to submit public comments via the comment form on
www.GatewayProgram.org.*

*Comments were distributed to the Board, posted on the GDC website, and recorded in the public
record.*

Name	Michael Demauro
Organization	Individual
Comment Topic	Gateway Project
I am an avid lover of rail and find myself constantly frustrated by the lack of progress on the Gateway project. On a daily basis, I read stories from around the world pertaining to the less cumbersome steps that Asian and European nations possess on megaprojects such as these.	

Name	Jay Arzu
Organization	University of Pennsylvania Stuart Weitzman School of Design
Comment Topic	Board or Advisory Committee
<p>"Good Day, My name is Jay Arzu I am a Ph.D. Student at the University of Pennsylvania Stuart Weitzman School of Design I wanted to find out if there is an advisory committee that I could join for this project. I have attached my resume. Best, Jay Arzu"</p> <p>http://www.gatewayprogram.org/wp-content/uploads/wpforms/5518-2beedb30b32749bc759d4bdcf45bdbe8/J.Arzu-2021-Resume-Q2-616dc79d85c25.pdf</p>	

JAY ARZU, MPA

347-241-3496 | Jay.Arzu@Fulbrightmail.org | <https://it.linkedin.com/in/jayarzu>

EDUCATION

University of Pennsylvania

PH.D Student City/Regional Planning

Philadelphia, PA
Expected: 2025

SDA Bocconi

Master of Public Administration (MPA)

Milan, Italy
December 2017

Marist College

Bachelor of Arts: Political Science and Government

Poughkeepsie, NY
May 2016

ACADEMIC HONORS

- U.S. Fulbright Grantee – Italy
- Washington Scholars Fellow

EXPERIENCE

University of Pennsylvania, Weitzman School of Design

Philadelphia, PA

PH.D Student City/Regional Planning

August 2021-Present

- Penn's Ph.D. program in City and Regional Planning has a straightforward objective: to train thought-leaders and exceptional scholars. To this end, the Graduate Group aims to ensure the acquisition of strong research and communication skills.
- The program is also committed to cultivating enduring faculty/student mentoring relationships and collegial networking, including other Ph.D. students in urban-focused disciplines.

Office of State Senator Samra Brouk (NY 55)

Rochester, NY

Community Outreach & Constituent Coordinator

December 2020-April 2021

- Monitoring and updating State Senator and Chief of Staff on district and local issues
- Acts as a liaison to agencies and individuals on all levels of government for the Senator and constituents
- Manage community casework assignments
- Assist with and plan virtual, office, and community events

Office of Kenyan R. McDuffie

Washington, DC

Planning Intern

July 2020-September 2020

- Assisting with the planning and coordination of The District of Columbia's Comprehensive Master Plan Update while providing general logistical and organizational support as needed
- Researching existing and potential projects related to urban development, infrastructure, land use, economic development, housing, environmental protection, historic preservation, and transportation

J Street

Washington, DC

Capitol South Regional Fellow

March 2020-May 2020

- Researching potential new supporters and donors, updating and managing supporter databases
- Assistance with donor and J Street volunteer relations
- Collaboration with staff on event tracking, logistics, and materials preparation

Congressional Black Caucus Foundation (CBCF)

Washington, DC

Transportation & Equity Research Fellow

May 2018-April 2019

- Conducted research and analysis in transportation as it relates to the intersectional analysis in economic opportunity, public health, education, and environmental sustainability to advance policy initiatives
- Researched, and analyzed, public policy and social issues to facilitate reports and information gathering and dissemination
- Engaged relevant stakeholders in policy initiatives and devise and develop methods and procedures to evaluate policy issues impacting black communities.

Vox Global

Washington, DC

Public Affairs Intern

August-October 2016

- Assisted Vox Global team with research, media outreach, writing, advocacy and more
- Focused on government relations and advocacy projects to cultivate, educate, and mobilize networks to take action on public policy priorities.

Dutchess County Legislator Francena Amparo

Poughkeepsie, NY

Transportation Intern

May-December 2017

- Completed research on the multiple transportation networks in Dutchess County, New York
- Worked with numerous stakeholders to develop recommendations on how to redesign the county bus system
- Attended county legislative hearings to remain informed about decisions regarding the redesign of local bus routes

Office of Senator Charles E. Schumer

Washington, DC
June-August 2016

Legislative Intern

- Completed research on transportation, urban development, and housing issues
- Supported Legislative Assistant by drafting memos and provided timely updates on legislative developments
- Managed projects and assisted in planning events

Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute (CHCI), Office of Representative José Serrano

Washington, DC
June-August 2015

Congressional Intern

- Supported office correspondence and handled constituent phone calls
- Attended briefings and hearings to provide staff with summaries and legislative updates

Name	Maurice Wells
Organization	Individual
Comment Topic	Portal Bridge Construction
<p>My name is Maurice Wells . I wish to comment on the Portal Bridge Project. I was extremely glad to hear that New Jersey Transit has approved for construction of the new Portal Bridge. This indeed welcome news to New Jersey Transit, and Amtrack riders . This project was delayed for three years, due to the previous presidents administration. Construction of this much needed bridge should start as soon as possible, because the longer you wait to start construction, the more expensive it is going to cost. Start on this project as soon as possible. Thank you for allowing me to testify.</p>	

Name	Joseph Clift
Organization	Individual
Comment Topic	Portal North Bridge: Answers to questions requested from commissioners
<p>Please post my single page of comments. I believe the answers to the questions I have asked of commissioners will give the entire GDC Board great concern with allowing NJ Transit to move forward with the current \$1.8 billion Portal North Bridge Project. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.</p> <p>http://www.gatewayprogram.org/wp-content/uploads/wpforms/5518-2beedb30b32749bc759d4bdcf45bdbe8/211025-JMClift-GDC-Bd-Mtg-Comments-Submitted-10-24-21-6175a020d3f64.pdf</p>	

Joseph M. Clift* Comments to the Gateway Development Commission, Monday, Oct. 25, 2021

I have a single request of the GDC Board today, especially Co-Chair Steven M. Cohen and Commissioners Jamey Barbas and Marie Therese Dominguez, the Board's three New York State members: Please provide clear, unequivocal public answers to the following questions regarding the Portal North Bridge Project:

1. Is the \$1.8 billion Portal North Bridge Project (PNB) **part of Gateway Program Phase 1**, despite never being approved by the GDC Board and 100% under the control of NJ Transit?

2. Is New York State **responsible for 50% of the \$819 million** being paid by New Jersey for PNB, as required for Phase I projects in the Gateway Program's bi-state enabling legislation?

3. Do the New York Commissioners agree with the **\$778 million greater payment by New York** vs. New Jersey for the Hudson Tunnel Project (HTP), described in the August 2021 HTP Financial Plan submitted to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)? This excess payment was described by GDC staff as catch-up for New York State paying nothing on PNB.

4. Are commissioners aware that a modern movable low-level bridge, similar to Amtrak's new \$150 million bascule bridge across the Niantic River on the Northeast Corridor in Connecticut, **would work perfectly well as a replacement** for Portal Bridge given the reality that there is virtually no maritime traffic requiring Portal to open – one trip/month or less – and the fact that Portal no longer has to open during weekday peak periods? Such a change in technology for PNB from the current \$1.8 billion high-level fixed bridge could save taxpayers \$1.5 billion.

5. Are commissioners aware that NJ Transit's June 2020 5-Year Capital Plan specifies and prices a **low-level movable bridge** for the future Portal South Bridge Project (part of unfunded Gateway Phase II), thereby reducing that bridge's cost from \$2 billion to \$400 million? If it works in the future for Portal South Bridge, why not now for Portal North Bridge?

6. Are commissioners aware that New York's and New Jersey's costs for PNB will each **increase by \$383 million** when the FTA's \$766.5 million Core Capacity grant is rescinded and all disbursements clawed back once the truth that **PNB does not add any additional a.m. peak-hour seating capacity** into New York Penn Station – as required by law – is finally acknowledged by the federal government? Replacing a two-track low-level movable bridge that does not open during peak periods with a two-track high-level fixed bridge does not add any peak-hour capacity, and NJ Transit's claim is clearly false that PNB should be credited with the seating capacity gained by 1) the return of one NJT peak-hour train removed from the schedule in 2018 due to non-bridge factors and 2) the addition of new Multilevel III passenger rail cars due in 2023.

7. Shouldn't commissioners take full advantage of having a recognized world **expert in bridge design**, New York Commissioner Jamey Barbas, on the Board?

I believe the answers to these questions will give the entire GDC Board great concern with allowing NJ Transit to move forward with the current \$1.8 billion Portal North Bridge Project. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

* Joseph M. Clift served as Director of Planning and Director of Strategic Planning for the Long Island Rail Road and Manager of Operations Improvement and Strategic Planning Analyst for Conrail. He holds a B.S. (M.E.) from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and an M.B.A. from the Stanford Graduate School of Business. jmclift@alum.mit.edu, 917-284-5491

GATEWAY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
November 16, 2021

Public Comments for November 16, 2021 Board Meeting

*The public was encouraged to submit public comments via the comment form on
www.GatewayProgram.org.*

*Comments were distributed to the Board, posted on the GDC website, and recorded in the public
record.*

Name	George Lobman
Organization	UTCA
Comment Topic	Tunnel timeline
Now that the Transportation bill has been passed and signed, how long would you anticipate it being available for commitment to contracts for first phases?	

Name	Sanjeev Ramchandra
Organization	individual
Comment Topic	Transit Proposal regarding Gateway Tunnel and Penn Station
<p>"I have important information to share with you regarding the Gateway Tunnel and Penn Station. I have designed a transit plan that reduces road congestion and increases economic development. Please see the attachment for my presentation slides that describe my plan for the NY - NJ region. I'm sending my proposal to various transportation, community, business, and government leaders. Thanks for your time and attention and please feel free to share this information with anyone else."</p> <p>http://www.gatewayprogram.org/wp-content/uploads/wpforms/5518-2beedb30b32749bc759d4bdcf45bdbe8/Post-Gateway-Transit-Proposal-618d57826c40d.mp4</p>	

Name	Michael Shapiro
Organization	BrianAnsari and Associates Inc.
Comment Topic	Board Meeting Notices
Please add me to your mailing list and invitations to your board meetings.	

Name	Laura Colacurcio
Organization	Association for a Better New York (ABNY), Inc.
Comment Topic	Comments in Support of the Gateway Program
<p>"The Association for a Better New York (ABNY), Inc. remains supportive of the Gateway Program and urges the federal government to lend its full support to the project and all of its components. The health and future of the New York City economy, and that of the Tri-state area, are dependent upon a reliable transportation system.</p> <p>The recently improved financial plan submitted by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey and the Gateway Development Corporation for the Hudson Tunnel Project makes clear the case for an improved project rating from Federal Transit Administration in short order. This rating is critical to move the project forward quickly and efficiently.</p> <p>We were delighted to see progress in awarding a contract for the construction of the Portal North Bridge and applaud New Jersey Transit and the Board of Directors for taking another step forward.</p> <p>In addition, we are thrilled at the passage of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill (BIF). While the Hudson Tunnel Project can move forward with current funding levels, BIF has the potential to impact the project overall and help transit projects across the region, and across the country, come to fruition by increasing the funding made available. Infrastructure investment is crucial to economic and environmental success and prosperity for all."</p>	

Name	Ryan Spearing
Organization	MCFA
Comment Topic	SDVOSB Goals
Will there be Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) Goals for the Gateway Program?	

Name	Ella Rodriguez
Organization	Individual
Comment Topic	NJ Transit Commuter
Will my commute be affected?	

Name	Brian Fritsch
Organization	Build Gateway Now Coalition
Comment Topic	Call for an improved rating for Hudson Tunnel Project from the FTA

"Hello, I'm Brian Fritsch, Campaign Manager for the Build Gateway Now Coalition. Build Gateway Now is a coalition of over 45 civic, labor, business, and elected groups united by a single tenet - the Gateway Program is the nation's most urgent infrastructure project.

The Gateway Coalition applauds Congress for passing the Bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and President Biden for signing it yesterday. It is a historic and generational investment in the nation's rail systems and sends a clear message - we should no longer tolerate century-old assets plagued with problems that cause numerous delays. Rather we should build a network for rail that will get commuters around faster, safer, and more reliably than ever before.

We know, however, the deal does not explicitly guarantee funding for the Gateway Program or the Hudson Tunnel Project. That's why we call on the Federal Transit Administration to submit an improved project rating as quickly as possible. The improved financial plan submitted in August meets the benchmarks needed for a medium or better rating, and the update is crucial to getting the project done quickly and efficiently. Acting swiftly will help avoid catastrophe if the existing tunnel must be partially shut down for an extended period.

We also want to highlight how this project will help us reach our collective economic and climate goals. The construction of the Hudson Tunnel project alone has been projected to create 17,000 jobs and \$19 billion in economic activity, while the Portal North Bridge project will create another 11,600 jobs. Avoiding a partial shutdown of the Hudson Tunnel project will result in two million fewer tons of harmful CO2 emissions, avoid a \$16 billion dollar hit to the national economy, and spare Northern New Jersey a \$22 billion reduction in property values. We must not delay.

We must also move an early works program for the Hudson Tunnel Project forward as quickly as possible. This could include important project elements such as completing the concrete casing or building a bridge over Tonnele Ave. We congratulate Amtrak on taking a huge step forward in this process with the acquisition of block 675 in Manhattan since the last meeting. It's great to see work beginning there.

Finally, congratulations to NJ Transit and their board of directors for recently awarding a contract for construction for the Portal North Bridge. It's great to see our advocacy for the Gateway Program take another step toward reality. This is a win for the economy and the environment.

Thank you to the members of the Gateway Development Commission for your continued service, and for the opportunity to submit our public comment to you today."

http://www.gatewayprogram.org/wp-content/uploads/wpforms/5518-2beedb30b32749bc759d4bdcf45bdbe8/WIN_20211115_14_57_49_Pro-6192be2068ae2.mp4

Name	Kathryn Wylde
Organization	Partnership for New York City
Comment Topic	Hudson Tunnel FTA Rating
<p>The Gateway project is a top priority for the economic future of New York City and the nation; it will be a key connector between our financial and commercial capital and the rest of America. Gateway will help attract riders back to the public transit system, support the recovery of the tourism industry, and encourage workers to return to the office. A high rating from the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) is merited for this project and an expedited FTA review will allow this critical infrastructure investment to move forward in a timely manner.</p>	

Name	Robert Wessels
Organization	General Contractors Association of NY
Comment Topic	Gateway Support

Good morning, I am Robert Wessels, the Executive Director of the General Contractors Association of New York (GCA), and I am here today representing the GCA’s 300 member firms and their over 25,000 professional and represented trades workers who have built the metropolitan region’s heavy civil infrastructure – its roads, bridges, tunnels, water& sewer, and rail and transit systems – since 1909.

The GCA, as you may know, is also Co-Chair of both the Gateway NOW Coalition and the Coalition for the Northeast Corridor (CNEC). Over the last five years, as part of those groups, and also on our own, we have actively advocated for both federal funding and administrative approvals for the Gateway project, as well as for local matching shares from the states of New York and New Jersey.

Accordingly, we join with you in celebrating two significant developments over the last few months that have put Gateway on the path to success.

First, and perhaps the most critically important of the two, was the Congressional passage two weeks ago of the federal Infrastructure Investment Jobs Act (IIJA), more commonly referred to as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal (BID). The BID will most assuredly help provide a robust financial foundation to advance not only the new Gateway Hudson River Tunnels themselves, but a number of additional supporting rail projects in the region.

Secondly was the commitment over the last three months by the Governors of New York and New Jersey to fully fund their shares of the project in accordance with the tripartite agreement negotiated with the federal government back in 2015.

When all these factors are combined with the revised financial plan for the project submitted earlier this year to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) by this Commission and the Port Authority, we are optimistic for a positive – and hopefully imminent -- “medium” project rating, which would qualify the project for an FTA Capital Investment Grant (CIG). We will continue to advocate for prompt FTA action in this regard.

We also look forward to working with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) to potentially secure additional rail grants that were authorized and funded in the BID.

In fact, we have already had conversations with both the new FRA Administrator and FRA staff about how important it is for the Administration to act promptly to develop a streamlined grants process in order to expeditiously flow resources to worthy rail initiatives such as Gateway.

While GCA members will not only build the Gateway project, as residents of the region we will also benefit from the broader mobility and economic activity it generates and are also supportive of quick action to advance other important elements of the project along the Northeast Corridor (NEC).

In that regard we are pleased that New Jersey Transit (NJT) is moving forward on the construction of the Portal North Bridge, which will ultimately facilitate the efficient use of both the existing North River Tunnels, as well as the two new additional tunnels. It's a very important first step and we commend NJT on that commitment.

In conclusion, you can be assured that we will continue our efforts to support the project through regular interaction with Members of Congress, not only in New York, but all along the NEC, as well as with relevant state officials.

Our message will continue to be crystal clear -- there is absolutely no question that Gateway is critically important to millions in New York and New Jersey, but is also the linchpin of mobility along the entire Corridor.

Additionally, in the context of the need for the region and the nation to recover from the COVID pandemic, Gateway has never been more important. It will create many tens of thousands of good paying middle class construction jobs, as well as many billions of dollars in peripheral economic activity.

We thank you, the members of this Commission, for the work you have done and continue to do to advance this project and look forward to continuing to work in partnership with you in order to build it better, faster, smarter, and more cost effectively.

Thank you.

Name	Felicia Park-Rogers
Organization	Tri-State Transportation Campaign
Comment Topic	Gateway Project/ Hudson Tunnels
<p>Congratulations to Congress and the President on passing the Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal. The bill is a huge win for the Gateway Program and supporters of rail and transit across the region. We are especially pleased by the tremendous efforts of the delegations of New York and New Jersey, and in particular their support of the Gateway Project, without whom this would not have been possible</p> <p>With the passage of the Infrastructure Bill and the improved financial plan submitted by the Port Authority and GDC for the Hudson Tunnel project, we must have an improved project rating from Federal Transit Administration in short order. The plan meets all the benchmarks needed for a medium or better rating, and the improvement in the rating is crucial to getting the project done quickly and efficiently. This will help us avoid catastrophe if the existing tunnel must be partially shutdown for an extended period.</p> <p>Gateway is critical for the economy's recovery from the pandemic. Construction of the Hudson Tunnel project alone has been projected to create 17,000 jobs and \$19B in economic activity, while the Portal North Bridge will create another 11,600 jobs. There has never been a better time to invest in the future of our region. We have already delayed far too long in acting on this project and every day of additional delay adds \$1.2 million in inflation to the project's overall cost.</p> <p>We must move an early works program for the Hudson Tunnel Project forward as expediently as possible. This could include important project elements such as completing the concrete casing or building a bridge over Tonnele Ave., among others.</p> <p>Congratulations to NJ Transit and their board of directors for recently awarding a contract for construction for the Portal North Bridge. It's great to see our advocacy for the Gateway Program take another step toward reality in a win for the economy and the environment.</p>	

Name	Andrew Karas
Organization	Individual
Comment Topic	Project scope / alternatives
<p>"Operational strategies are nearly as important as infrastructure strategies. I urge the commission to forcefully urge implementation of through-running to make travel via the North and East River tunnels more appealing to customers and to reduce equipment dwell time at Penn Station. Such changes to operations will dramatically multiply the positive impact of the Gateway Program.</p> <p>As a lower priority, but still important, I urge the commission to plan for connections between Penn Station and Grand Central via a new commuter rail tunnel through Midtown. At the very least, the commission should ensure that infrastructure associated with Gateway is not designed in such a way as to preclude later, additional connections."</p>	

Name	Joseph Clift
Organization	Individual
Comment Topic	Portal North Bridge
See next page	

Please provide public answers to more questions regarding the Portal North Bridge Project
Joseph M. Clift* Comments to the Gateway Development Commission, Tuesday, November 16, 2021

Good morning commissioners.

I wish to add the following questions to you regarding the Portal North Bridge Project (PNB) to those I delivered to Commission staff for the Monday, October 25 Board meeting (please note the following page), canceled on October 24. Again, these questions and their answers should be especially important to Co-Chair Steven M. Cohen and Commissioners Jamey Barbas and Marie Therese Dominguez, the Board's three New York State members; PNB is legally a Gateway Phase I project, which makes New York State legally responsible for exactly half (50%) of the local share, yet all decisions to date regarding the project have been made by NJ Transit officials, without any input from New York State. This looks to me like taxation without representation.

All of these questions are a result of my belated discovery that the \$1.56 billion PNB construction project, approved at a special NJ Transit Board meeting on October 12, is vastly over budget, so any celebrating today over approval of the contract would seem out of place. My additional questions --- the spreadsheet on the third page details the changes in PNB costs:

1. Did you know that the \$1.56 billion PNB Construction Contract award approved unanimously at the Oct. 12 special Board meeting is \$340 million (28%) over the \$1.22 billion budget submitted to the FTA and agreed to in the Full Funding Grant Agreement contract (FFGA) signed by NJT and FTA officials last January?
2. Did you know that the Total Project Cost has increased from \$1.8 billion in the PNB Financial Plan submitted to the FTA in August 2020 to \$1.8 billion agreed to in the January 2021 FFGA contract to \$2.2 billion following approval of the \$1.56 billion Construction Contract at last month's special Board meeting?
3. Did you know that the project has become so expensive that its cost now exceeds the maximum identified \$328 million in overrun funding by \$32 million; effectively, the project is out of money before the first spade is turned?
4. Did you know that only two of the four pre-qualified bidders submitted bids for construction?
5. Isn't it past time to consider more cost-effective bridge designs or at the very least, turn down the two received bids as not in line with NJT's professional estimators' cost (\$487 million/45% higher), better define the project and rebid the construction contract in the expectation of getting bids from all four pre-qualified bidders and a lower price?

I believe the answers to these questions will give the entire GDC Board great concern with allowing NJ Transit to move forward with the current \$1.8 billion Portal North Bridge Project.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

* Joseph M. Clift served as Director of Planning and Director of Strategic Planning for the Long Island Rail Road and Manager of Operations Improvement and Strategic Planning Analyst for Conrail. He holds a B.S. (M.E.) from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and an M.B.A. from the Stanford Graduate School of Business. jmclift@alum.mit.edu, 917-284-5491
[/211116 JMClift GDC Bd Mtg Comments](#)

Please provide public answers to questions regarding the Portal North Bridge Project
Joseph M. Clift* Comments to the Gateway Development Commission, Monday, Oct. 25, 2021

I have a single request of the GDC Board today, especially Co-Chair Steven M. Cohen and Commissioners Jamey Barbas and Marie Therese Dominguez, the Board's three New York State members: Please provide clear, unequivocal public answers to the following questions regarding the Portal North Bridge Project:

1. Is the \$1.8 billion Portal North Bridge Project (PNB) **part of Gateway Program Phase 1**, despite never being approved by the GDC Board and 100% under the control of NJ Transit?

2. Is New York State **responsible for 50% of the \$819 million** being paid by New Jersey for PNB, as required for Phase I projects in the Gateway Program's bi-state enabling legislation?

3. Do the New York Commissioners agree with the **\$778 million greater payment by New York** vs. New Jersey for the Hudson Tunnel Project (HTP), described in the August 2021 HTP Financial Plan submitted to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)? This excess payment was described by GDC staff as catch-up for New York State paying nothing on PNB.

4. Are commissioners aware that a modern movable low-level bridge, similar to Amtrak's new \$150 million bascule bridge across the Niantic River on the Northeast Corridor in Connecticut, **would work perfectly well as a replacement** for Portal Bridge given the reality that there is virtually no maritime traffic requiring Portal to open – one trip/month or less – and the fact that Portal no longer has to open during weekday peak periods? Such a change in technology for PNB from the current \$1.8 billion high-level fixed bridge could save taxpayers \$1.5 billion.

5. Are commissioners aware that NJ Transit's June 2020 5-Year Capital Plan specifies and prices a **low-level movable bridge** for the future Portal South Bridge Project (part of unfunded Gateway Phase II), thereby reducing that bridge's cost from \$2 billion to \$400 million? If it works in the future for Portal South Bridge, why not now for Portal North Bridge?

6. Are commissioners aware that New York's and New Jersey's costs for PNB will each **increase by \$383 million** when the FTA's \$766.5 million Core Capacity grant is rescinded and all disbursements clawed back once the truth that **PNB does not add any additional a.m. peak-hour seating capacity** into New York Penn Station – as required by law – is finally acknowledged by the federal government? Replacing a two-track low-level movable bridge that does not open during peak periods with a two-track high-level fixed bridge does not add any peak-hour capacity, and NJ Transit's claim is clearly false that PNB should be credited with the seating capacity gained by 1) the return of one NJT peak-hour train removed from the schedule in 2018 due to non-bridge factors and 2) the addition of new Multilevel III passenger rail cars due in 2023.

7. Shouldn't commissioners take full advantage of having a recognized world **expert in bridge design**, New York Commissioner Jamey Barbas, on the Board?

I believe the answers to these questions will give the entire GDC Board great concern with allowing NJ Transit to move forward with the current \$1.8 billion Portal North Bridge Project. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

* Joseph M. Clift served as Director of Planning and Director of Strategic Planning for the Long Island Rail Road and Manager of Operations Improvement and Strategic Planning Analyst for Conrail. He holds a B.S. (M.E.) from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and an M.B.A. from the Stanford Graduate School of Business. jmclift@alum.mit.edu, 917-284-5491

**11/09/21 Portal North Bridge Cost Analysis (Public Transportation/Core Capacity & Intercity Rail):
09/18/20 Financial Plan vs. 01/14/21 FFGA vs. 10/12/21 Construction Contract Bid**

Joseph M. Clift, jmclift@alum.mit.edu, 212-245-6299, (m) 917-284-5491

1 FFGA Category & Description		\$'s Millions, YOE (Year of Expenditure)								
		09/18/20 Portal North Bridge (PNB) Financial Plan	01/14/21 vs. 09/18/20		01/14/21 PNB FFGA Contract (PMOC Report)	10/12/21 vs. 01/14/21		10/12/21 PNB Construction Contract Award	10/12/21 vs. 09/18/20	
			\$'s Chng	% Chng		\$'s Chng	% Chng		\$'s Chng	% Chng
4	10 Guideway & Track Elements	704	99	14%	803					
5	40 Sitework & Special Conditions	251	17	7%	268					
6	50 Systems	160	10	6%	170					
7	Construction (10-50)									
8	Force Account Work (07/15/20 Plan)	21			21			21		
9	Construction Contract	1094	126	12%	1220	340	28%	1560	466	43%
10	Construction Subtotal (10-50)	1115	126	11%	1241	340	27%	1581	466	42%
11	60 ROW, Land, Existing Improvements	21			24			24		
12	70 Vehicles	71			71			71		
13	80 Professional Services	207			207			207		
14	Non-Construction Subtotal (60-70)	300			302			302		
15	Subtotal (10-80)	1415	129	9%	1543	340	22%	1883	468	33%
16	90 Unallocated Contingency									
17	Force Account Work 20%							4		
18	Construction Contract 5% (Bd approved)							78		
19	Non-Construction 10%							30		
20	Unallocated Contingency Subtotal	221	-47	-21%	173	-61	-35%	112	-108	-49%
21	Project Capital Cost (10-90)	1636	81	5%	1717	279	16%	1995	360	22%
22	100 Finance Charges (apply 1/14/21 Finance Charges/Capital Cost Ratio to 10/12/21)	168	12	7%	180	29	16%	209		
23	Total Project Cost (10-100)	1804	93	5%	1897	308	16%	2205	401	22%
24	Construction Bid vs. Professional Cost Est.									
25	Construction Contract Bid	N/A			N/A			1560		
26	Budgeted Construction Cost.							1220		
27	Allocated Contingency(PMOC Rprt Pg,3)							-147		
28	Professional Cost Estimate							-1073		
29	Construction Bid Over Prof. Cost Est.							45%	487	
30	Comparison of Project Capital Cost to:									
31	1. FFGA Maximum Likely Proj. Cap. Cost									
32	Project Capital Cost (10-90)	1636			1717			1995		
33	Maximum Likely Project Capital Cost (12/1/20 FFGA PMOC Report, Pg. 19)	-1832			-1832			-1832		
34	Project Capital Cost Over/Under(-)	-11%	-196		-6%	-115		9%	163	
35	2. FFGA Stress Test – 10% Cost Overrun									
36	Project Capital Cost (10-90)	1636			1717			1995		
37	10% Cost Overrun (Nov. 2020 Financial Capacity Assessment, Pg. 14)	171			171			171		
38	Base Funds Identified (01/14/21 FFGA)	1717			1717			1717		
39	Funds Available w 15% Overrun	-1888			-1888			-1888		
40	Project Capital Cost Over/Under(-)	-15%	-252		-10%	-171		5%	108	
41	3. Maximum Identified Capital Funds									
42	Project Capital Cost (10-90)	1636			1717			1995		
43	Maximum Identified Overrun Funds (9/18/21 PNB Fin. Plan, Pg. 2-38)	328			328			328		
44	Base Funds Identified (9/18/21 Fin. Plan)	1636			1636			1636		
45	Maximum Identified Capital Funds	-1964			-1964			-1964		
46	Project Capital Cost Over/Under(-)	-20%	-328		-14%	-247		2%	32	